



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,518	08/02/2003	Jared Green	13768.783.92	4345
47973	7590	09/20/2007		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,518

Applicant(s)

GREEN ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-44 and 46-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-44, 46-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-44, 46-51 are presented for the examination. Claims 2, 45 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **1, 19-24, 40, 45, 50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2), in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) and further in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1).

As to claim 1, Dawson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a configuration request (received event is received directly from a client; generating a server-to-server event message for said received event, col 9, ln 18-21/a sever-to-server event message 50, col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator 53 responds to one of the received client or server events for which the coupled server 17 is a receiver by generating a server-to-server event message 50, col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator generates a server-to server event message in response to the request from the client), indicating(source trail of received message, col 9, ln 45-50/ A server –to –server event message is generated for the received event, the message including: ... a source trail indicating, col 2, ln 24-28/ the event message is

Art Unit: 2194

transmitted to the receiving server only if the receiver server identifier is absent from the parsed source trail, col 2, ln 40-43), a set of one or more receivers(the ones of receivers 12, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, col 5, ln 57-59), receiving a configuration request, the configuration request indicating a selection of a set of one or more logging software object(col 5, ln 47-59/ col 8, ln 45-48/ ln 62-65/col 9, ln 45-50), instantiating the set of one or more logging software objects according to the received configuration request(col 4, ln 22-29/col5, ln 47-59) and publishing the message to the set of one or more logging software objects define in the configuration request(col 8, ln 45-48/ ln 62-65/col 9, ln 45-50/ col 5, ln 47-59), a trace object(the event message 50, col 5, ln 50-55/ col 6, ln 1-5), a trace object in a uniform format that is utilized by the logging software object(the event message 50 includes . . a fully constructed text message 63, preferably in the primary text language [uniform format]of the server 10, col 6, ln 1-6/ the receiving server has a listing of events by event identifier and corresponding text messages in the primary text language of the receiving server... the receiving server logs the received server-to-server event, employing the identified text message in the listing in the text language of the receiving server, col 2, ln 50-60).

Dawson does not explicitly teach software object separate from the application being tested that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a format different that the format used by the application being tested, receiving request to log message from the application being tested. However, Pankovein teaches software object separate from the application being tested that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a format different that the format used by the application being tested, receiving request to log message from the application being tested (the client 132 executes a software test, and produces a test log that is stored as a file on the client'

Art Unit: 2194

hard drive. It is assumed for the purpose of this example that the test log is in format#2. At step 202, the client calls the Openfile function via the interface 148, and passed the location of the file and the file type to the parsing engine 126. The parsing engine 126 then loads the plug-in module 122 at the step 202. At the step 202, the parsing engine 126 calls the ParseLogResults function of plug-in module 122 via interface 142, and sends the location of the log file as part of the logHandle parameter. At step 202, the plug-in module 122 parses the data in the log file and converts the results from their original format and categories into a simple tally... the parsing engine returns the results to the client 132 in standard format, col 6, ln 42-62/ col 5, ln 35-42).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson to incorporate the feature of software object separate from the application being tested that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a format different than the format used by the application being tested, receiving request to log message from the application being tested because this allows the data in the standard format from the records to be stored in a database.

Dawson and Pankovein do not teach the selection having been dynamically entered by a computer user. However, Godbole teaches the selection having been dynamically entered by a computer user (the user input 16 allows the user to determine the various transforms that are applied to the raw data, col 3, ln 41-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson and Pankovein to incorporate the feature of the selection having been dynamically entered by a computer user because this allows user the ability to automatically apply the data flow to the corrected transformations.

Dawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach the configuration request indicating for each logging software object, which type of information is to be logged by the logging software object, configuration request including the format type of information and members of the selected set of logging software objects. However, Kougiouris teaches the configuration request indicating for each logging software object, which type of information is to be logged by the logging software object, configuration request including the format type of information and members of the selected set of logging software objects (Each event logged by a module may be associated with one or more event "categories". Event categories may be defined in any of various ways. For example, in one embodiment, events are categorized according to the four purposes shown above, para [0033], ln 1-11 to para [0038], ln 1-5/ depending on whether events are logged into a flat file, a database, an external server, etc. The log viewer may be configured to display event information in any of various ways, e.g., by splitting events into their associated categories, displaying events in sequential order, separating events according to which module or application initiated the event log request, para[0046], ln 4-10/the event information received from the client-side logging component. The server-side logging component may log information such as the event message, the event level, the event categories for the event, the timestamp information, etc. The server side-logging component may, of course, also log other types of information. For example, the event information received from the client-side logging component may include information identifying the module or application that initiated the log request, etc., para [0085], ln 2-10).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson and Pankovein and Godbole to incorporate the

Art Unit: 2194

feature of configuration request indicating for each logging software object, which type of information is to be logged by the logging software object because this allows the client to alter the types of events they sent to the centralized event log without requiring code to be recompiled.

As to claim 19, Kougiouris teaches receiving the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message has been compiled (When requesting a client-side logging component to log an event, a module may pass the event mask information to determine whether the event is associated with a category, para [0060], ln 7-12/ If the client sign logging component determines that the event received from the client-side logging component may timestamp the event... creating a data structure representing the event, para[0077], ln 1-8), application is not required to be recompiled to publish messages(the types of events they sent to the centralized event lob, without requiring code to be recompiled, or the event service to be re-started, para[0008], ln 5-8).

As to claim 20, Kougiouris teaches the message is published on a first machine and wherein the request to log the message is received from a second machine (para [0086], ln 4-10/ para [0088], ln 1-6).

As to claim 21, Kougiouris teaches combining a request to log a first message from the first machine with a request to log a second message received from the second machine before publishing the message on the first machine (right col 7, ln 25-29).

As to claim 22, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

As to claim 23, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Pankovein teaches a logger having an interface

Art Unit: 2194

configured to received a configuration request to log (col 6, ln 45-48), a local publisher configured to receive a log message form the logger (col 6, ln 45-55) and Dawson teaches a set of one or more devices configured to log messages (various receivers are typically provided to receive certain of the events... example of receivers which are part of the server subsystem include server console 12, ... database, col 4, ln 28-35), the set selectable at run time (the logging distributor 54 examines the parsed source trail 62 of step 114 for the identifier of the coupled receiving server 18, col 45-50/ Fig. 1).

As to claim 24, Kougiouris teaches a filter configured to receive a notification when the local publisher publishes a message. (para [0093], ln 3-9).

As to claim 40, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Dawson teaches registering each device in the set with a publisher (col 1, ln 62-67/ col 2, ln 35-42).

As to claim 45, it is an apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

As to claim 50, it is an apparatus claim of claim 20; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.

3. Claims 3, 33-39, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1).

As to claim 3, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiuris do not teach the trace object is formatted in accordance with an extensible markup language (XML). However, Elmore teaches the trace object is formatted in accordance with an extensible markup language (XML)(logging service maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to determine whether to log a message, right col 134, ln 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Elmore because Elmore's an extensible markup language (XML) would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris's systems by providing a messages contain identifiers for the security of log event.

As to claim 33, Kougiouris teaches an application configured to request that messages be logged via the logger (para [0086], ln 5-6).

As to claim 34, Kougiouris teaches the application operates asynchronously with respect to the logger (para [0077], ln 8-12).

As to claim 35, Kougiouris teaches the application continues executing even if there is insufficient memory to log the message (para [0078], ln 10-15).

As to claim 36, Kougiouris teaches the application operates synchronously with respect to the logger (para [0077], ln 6-8).

As to claim 37, Dawson teaches the set of one or more devices is selected after the application is compiled (col 5, ln 50-60).

As to claim 38, Kougiouris teaches each device is configured to transform a received log message for display, output, storage, or transmission (para [0046], ln 1-12).

Art Unit: 2194

As to claim 39, Kougiouris teaches a reader configured to read a trace comprised of data derived from the log messages and to display the trace in a hierarchical manner (para [0046], ln 1-12).

As to claim 46, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

4. Claims **4, 9, 25, 28, 29, 43, 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842,870 B2).

As to claim 4, Dawson, Pandovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach each device is associated with an indication of the types of message logged. However, Austen teaches each device is associated with an indication of the types of messages logged (identifying an error type for the error log, responsive to an identification that the error log is a regional error log, identifying each partition to receive the error log, col 7, ln 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris with Austen to incorporate the feature of each device is associated with an indication of the types of messages logged because this provides an improved instruction of computer for handling particular errors log to corresponding logically partitioned data processing system.

As to claim 9, Austen teaches an environment variable (col 4, ln 32-37).

As to claim 25, Austen teaches the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices (filtering error logs such that only errors that pertain to a particular partition are reported to that partition, col 5, ln 3-7).

As to claims 28 and 29, Kougiouris teaches the interface provides access to methods associated with the logger, the interface being customized to operate with a programming language or programming model, wherein the programming model comprises a component object model (COM)(para [0092], ln 6-11).

As to claim 43, it is an apparatus claim of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 9 above.

As to claim 51, Austen teaches indicating what type of message or types of message to publish to the device (col 5, ln 29-37).

5. Claims **6-8, 41-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris (US 2005/0028171 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1).

As to claim 6, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Josyula

Art Unit: 2194

because Josyula's a command line parameter would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris's systems by allowing a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

As to claim 7, Dawson teaches database (col 4, ln 32-35) and Josyula teaches the command line parameter indicates that the set of devices to which to log messages is in a database (Para [0040], ln 3-12).

As to claim 8, Dawson teaches a registry (col1, ln 62-67).

As to claims 41, 42, they are apparatus claims of claims 6, 7; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6, 7 above.

6. Claims **10, 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Currey et al (US 6,769,079 B1).

As to claim 10, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach calling a filter to indicate that the message is available to be logged. However, Currey teaches calling a filter to indicate that the message is available to be logged (allowing filtering to determine which log message go to which of the specified destinations 68, 10, 72, based on a limited type of source information associated with the process that calls syslog (), col 4, ln 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris, and Currey

Art Unit: 2194

because Currey's calling a filter to indicate that the message is available to be logged would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole', Kougiouris's systems by providing a reliable and flexible logging of error which allows messages to be filtered and forwarded to different destination as desired.

As to claim 13, Dawson teaches the message to determine whether to send the message or data derived from the message to a device (col 6, ln 40-45).

As to claim 14, Currey teaches the request to log a message comes from a current thread (col 5, ln 52-55).

7. Claims **11, 47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) in view of Kougiouris (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769,079 B1) and further in view of Chirashnya et al (US. Patent 6,598,179 B1).

As to claim 11, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole , Kougiouris and Currey do not teach the filter is called through a callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a callback function (list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32, col 5, ln 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris, Currey and Chirashnya because Chirashnya's the filter is called through a callback function would improve

Art Unit: 2194

the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Currey's systems by allowing the callback function script to check each error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria can be easily modified and added to without recompilation of the system.

As to claim 47, it is an apparatus claim of claim 11; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 11 above.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769,079 B1) and further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management method).

As to claim 12, Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole, Kougiouris and Currey do not teach a notification by the filter that a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole, Kougiouris, Currey and Suwaki because Suwaki's a notification by the filter would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole, Kougiouris and Currey's systems by reducing the memory capacity necessary for holding the information.

9. Claims **15-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769,079 B1) and further in view of Maurille (US 6,484,196 B1).

As to claim 15, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Currey do not teach providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread. However, Maurille teaches providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread (threading information (parent and child message ID), col 3, ln 18-23/ thread ID, col 8, ln 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris, Currey and Maurille because Maurille's the filter is called through a callback function would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Currey's systems by allowing the internet with two levels of threading to transfer information between the nodes smoothly.

As to claim 16, Maurille teaches the context identifier further identifies a context of a parent thread associated with the current thread (col 3, ln 18-23/ col 8, ln 33-38).

As to claim 17, Maurille teaches publishing the message comprises providing information that uniquely identifies the thread (col 9, ln 10-15).

As to claim 18, Maurille teaches the information comprises an identifier that identifies a machine on which the current thread executes, a name of a process that spawned the current

Art Unit: 2194

thread, an identifier that identifies the process, and an identifier that identifies the thread (col 3, ln 15-25).

10. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) and further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management method).

As to claim 26, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach a notification by the filter that a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris to incorporate the feature of the filter because this provides the memory capacity necessary for reducing holding information needed by the system.

11. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) and further in view of Chirashnya et al (US. Patent 6,598,179 B1).

As to claim 27, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach the filter is called through a callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a callback function (list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32, col 5, ln 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris to incorporate the feature of the filter is called through a callback function because this allows the callback function script to check each error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria that can be easily modified and added to without recompilation of the system.

12. Claims **30-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Mohan (US. Patent 5,418,940).

As to claim 30, Drawson, Pankovein, Godbole , Kougiouris do not teach allocates a buffer. However, Mohan teaches allocates a buffer (allocated a log buffer 20 from main memory for storage of log records destined for system log 21, col 6, ln 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Drawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris with Mohan to incorporate the feature of allocates a buffer because this allows a buffer to be transmitted out for recording to minimize the seek and latency delays.

As to claim 31, Mohan teaches allocates memory from the buffer to receive the log message (col 6, ln 42-44).

13. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475), in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1).

As to claim 32, Dawson teaches trace object (col 2, ln 24-30). Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris do not teach log message in an extensible markup language (XML). However, Elmore teaches log message in an extensible markup language (XML)(logging service maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to determine whether to log a message, right col 13, ln 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Drawson, Pankovein and Godbole with Elmore to incorporate the feature of an extensible markup language (XML) because this provides a messages containing identifiers for the security of log event.

14. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1)

As to claim 44, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris with Josyula to incorporate the feature of a command line parameter because this allows a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

15. Claims **48, 49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2), in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768,475) and further in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1), and further in view of Maurille (US 6,484,196 B1).

As to claim 48, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris do not teach providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread. However, Maurille teaches providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread (threading information (parent and child message ID), col 3, ln 18-23/ thread ID, col 8, ln 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Maurille because Maurille's the filter is called through a callback function would improve the efficiency

Art Unit: 2194

of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris 's systems by allowing the internet with two levels of threading to transfer information between the nodes smoothly.

As to claim 49, Maurille teaches the context identifier further identifies a context of a parent thread associated with the current thread (col 3, ln 18-23/ col 8, ln 33-38).

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2194

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

September 14, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER